



REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
U.S. ARMY HUMAN RESOURCES COMMAND
DA SECRETARIAT FOR SENIOR ENLISTED SELECTION BOARDS
8899 EAST 56TH STREET
INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA 46249-5301

AHRC-PDV-SEB

18 June 2008

MEMORANDUM THRU Headquarters, United States Army Training and Doctrine Command, Attention: ATTG-P, 3 Fenwick Road, Building 11, Fort Monroe, VA 23651-1049

FOR Commander, Headquarters, United States Army Quartermaster Center, 1201 22nd Street, Fort Lee, VA, 23801-1601

SUBJECT: Career Management Field (CMF) 92 CMF Review and Analysis

1. Reference memorandum, HQDA, DAPE-MAPE-MPE-PD, 3 June 2008, subject: Memorandum of Instruction for the FY08 CSM/SGM Training and Selection Board.

2. In accordance with the referenced memorandum, the selection board panel reviewing records for CMF 92 CMF submits this Review and Analysis to assist you in executing your duties as proponent for MOS within this CMF.

3. Competence.

a. General. The overall quality of the 92 CMF records was excellent. The best qualified NCOs clearly achieved and maintained high patterns of performance in challenging positions. The evaluation report remains the single most important document on the OMPF that was reviewed by the selection board. However, in determining those best qualified for promotion, Soldiers were selected based on the "total Soldier" concept whereby the qualifications for promotion were judged by the entire record. Other important discriminators used to determine promotion selection included leadership, potential, military and civilian educational levels, awards, honors, physical fitness and military bearing.

b. Performance and Potential. The NCO Corps is very strong, versatile and competitive. All of the NCOs competing during this board had a mix of experience and had been deployed to OIF or OEF. Deployment and leadership opportunities such as First Sergeant, Detachment Sergeant, Team Leaders in Combat and Operation NCOICs were weighed heavily and favorably considered by the board. Exceptional performance of duty in the most challenging assignments at the current and next higher grade was of primary importance to the board.

d. Training and Education. Education was viewed favorably by the panel. Many NCOs have done extremely well ensuring that they were technically and tactically competent by seeking a well rounded military education through attending service schools; taking correspondence courses; and seeking off-duty education. Most NCOs attended Battle Staff and First Sergeant Course and the majority of the NCOs had at least an Associate's Degree.

e. Physical Fitness. The overall physical fitness of the 92 CMF NCOs was very good. Within the panel the following observations were made.

(1) Incremental height increases which sent a negative message to the panel.

(2) Failure to state that the NCO scored 90 points in each event and/or earned the APFT Badge left the panel uncertain of the rater's intent.

(3) Height/Weight. All NCOs considered for this board were within Army standards for height and weight. However, a concern was that although NCOs passed the tape, a few exceed the height and weight screening table. Of these Soldiers, their photos gave the appearance of being overweight.

f. Overall career management.

(1) NCOs whose evaluations were well written with clearly justified excellence ratings and clearly articulated statements regarding future potential were favorably considered for promotion. Many rating officials rendered and unsubstantiated "excellence" ratings by failing to quantify NCO performance and potential in the corresponding bullet comments.

(2) In most cases, raters and senior raters provided a clear picture of overall performance and potential. However, the panel did note a tendency among rating officials to inflate the NCOER as well as provide conflicting statements which did not support the current rating. There were cases where the evaluation had four or more justified excellent ratings and a marking of "Among the Best" and "2" blocks in both performance and potential which once again sent a conflicting message to the panel.

(3) The use of terminology such as "groom for CSM" indicates the NCO is not yet ready for promotion. Do not use the term groom if the intent is to promote now. Additionally, some records stated to assign the Soldier to a lateral position of greater responsibility. This is not the same as promote. If the intent is to promote now, state promote now.

(4) Use of specific ranking versus percentages to quantify an NCO such as: #1 out of 5 NCOs is preferred over using percentages such as "within the top 5% of the NCOs I rate."

(5) Recommendation for promote to SGM appears to be an indicator from the senior rater that the NCO lacks the leadership attributes expected of a CSM.

(6) OMPF/ERB Update: CMF 92 NCOs did a good job on updating their OMPF and validating their ERB. However, another concern across the panel was the number of NCOs who failed to validate their ERBs and updating their OMPF. File discrepancies reflect unfavorably on those instances. Commanders and Senior Enlisted Advisors must continue to ensure that NCOs in the zone of consideration have validated and updated their records.

(7) Photos: The CMF 92 under consideration had recent photos that generally reflected their authorized awards and decorations. Within the panel, photos were observed with NCOs wearing SFC rank. It is imperative that NCOs update their official photo whenever there are any changes to the uniform even if the current photo is less than five years old.

(8) NCOs that sought and performed well in challenging positions (i.e. First Sergeant, Detachment Sergeant, Combat Team NCOICs, SPO NCOICs and Senior Enlisted Advisor, etc...) received special consideration.

(9) There were several NCOs who had served successfully in SEA (SGM) positions as Master Sergeants. Panel members viewed this as a significant indicator of NCO potential for advancement.

(10) Additionally, Senior NCOs were favorably considered when they had a diversity of duty assignments as opposed to remaining at the same duty location for multiple tours.

4. CMF Structure and Career Progression Statement.

a. MOS compatibility within CMF. All NCOs in the CMF have the ability to gain a broad base of experience within the branch and are not managed exclusively in any area. It is imperative that NCOs take an aggressive approach in their quest for advancement and seek out those challenging positions published by the Quartermaster Career Management Branch.

b. Suitability of standards of grade and structure. The standards of grade and force structure are appropriate and compatible with other CMFs. They are understood by others outside the CMF; however, it is imperative that specific duty positions are clearly defined in terms that are common throughout the Army in regards to leadership positions.

c. Assignment and promotion opportunity. There are adequate opportunities to serve in the most challenging positions within the CMF as well as outside the CMF in order to be competitive for promotion to CSM/SGM.

d. Overall Health of the CMF. The health of the CMF as excellent. The panel review of CMF 92 records indicated a career field of highly motivated NCOs who clearly demonstrated their potential to serve at the CSM/SGM level.

5. Recommendations.


a. Competence. CMF 92 NCOs need to continue to seek out the challenging positions that offer the combination of leadership and technical expertise.

b. CMF Structure and Career Progression. It is imperative that leadership encourage NCO opportunities to seek out challenging assignments. CMF 92 NCO assignments were well managed, ensuring diversity and ample opportunity for upward mobility within the CMF.

6. CMF Proponent Packet.

a. Overall quality. The proponent packet contained useful information that prepared panel members to review and establish important standards to evaluate key billets, schooling and accomplishments specific to the CMF 92 MOS.

b. Recommended improvements. Quartermaster Branch Proponent Information Packet showed a clear and definite picture of challenging duty positions for the panel members. This enabled the panel to select the best qualified NCOs for promotion. As the Global War on Terrorism continues and challenging contingencies happen across the globe, duty titles and descriptions accurately reflecting the rated Soldier's position and responsibilities are critical. Clarity will eliminate uncertainty and accurately reflect the magnitude and impact of the duties performed. Recommend that the Quartermaster Branch continue to emphasize the importance of the duty positions and responsibility of the CMF 92 NCO.


VIRGIL S. L. WILLIAMS
COL, LG
Panel Chief